

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6-13 are presented for consideration, with Claim 1 being independent.

An editorial change has been made to the specification. In addition, a new abstract is being submitted to better set forth the technical aspects of Applicants' invention.

In the claims, Claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art, and Claims 6-13 have been added to provide an additional scope of protection. Support for the new claims can be found, for example, on page 9, line 7, *et. seq.*, of the specification. Claims 2-5 have been cancelled.

Initially, Claims 2-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Claims 2-5 have been cancelled. This rejection is therefore deemed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

Applicants wish to point out that new Claim 7 includes some of the features previously recited in Claim 2. Support for Claim 7 can be found, for example, in Figures 4A-4C, 5A and 5B, and the accompanying specification beginning on page 13, line 1.

Applicants note with appreciation that Claims 3-5 are indicated as containing patentable subject matter. In this regard, it is understood that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 as set forth in paragraph 6 (page 4) of the Office Action applies to Claim 2 and not Claim 3.

As noted above, Claims 2-5 have been cancelled. In amending Claim 1, an effective voltage calculating circuit and a compensation value calculating circuit based on features in Claim 3 have been added.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Suzuki '361. In addition, Claim 2, as understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over Suzuki in view of Sarrasin. Without conceding to the propriety of these rejections, Claim 1 has been amended to include features of Claim 3 not taught or suggested in the prior art, and Claim 2 has been cancelled. These rejections are therefore deemed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 6-13 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
SDM/vnm